

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill

now make certain that we discharge this responsibility. Having accepted the responsibility, I and the hon. members of this House will expect this government to prepare itself to discharge its responsibilities and, incidentally, to tell us how it intends to enforce these measures it proposes.

An hon. Member: Through flower power.

Another hon. Member: Through Jamieson's navy.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: When discussing the north, the Prime Minister suggested that we might make a claim to sovereignty. I suppose his remarks also applied to the question of jurisdiction. The Prime Minister said recognition could only be denied us in one of two ways, either taking us to the courts or taking us to war. I suppose the choice of weapon would be up to us. The Prime Minister has eliminated the possibility of being taken to court. Does this mean he was serious when he made those remarks? Does he expect we might be taken to war in the course of exercising this jurisdiction? Surely not, Mr. Speaker. Surely, this was a case of over-simplification when the Prime Minister put forward this view of the position of our country. I think we must regard it as one of his less sensible remarks.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs and the government owe this House and the people of Canada an explanation as to how Canada proposes to enforce these regulations which apply to areas beyond our territorial waters. This is what this government is asking Parliament to define. If we accept that responsibility, then we must carry it out. We must not fail, not only because we do not want to look silly but because we have accepted a heavy responsibility.

I believe the Canadian people will support these measures if they are enforced. However, they want to know how the government hopes to enforce them. Without taking any more time of the House this afternoon, while there will be many questions of detail with regard to the bill that can be examined in committee, I say without any reservation that I and my party support Bill C-202 in principle. We very earnestly support it as a measure to control the pollution of the north. However, we would like some information as to why this limit of 100 miles was chosen and we would like to know how the government proposes to enforce these regulations. While this party very heartily endorses the purpose of this bill,

we and the people of Canada regret very much that in the process of placing these two bills before the House the government is redefining our territorial waters in such a way as to, in effect, abandon the Canadian claim of sovereignty of waters between the islands as well as some of the waters surrounding the islands. The abandonment of this claim will likely haunt governments for many years to come. It is very likely it will prejudice the permanent position of Canada in the north, a most regrettable situation.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that Bills C-202 and C-203 complement each other. Therefore, I think they must be considered together when the basic principles underlying this legislation are under discussion. I want to begin by congratulating this government on introducing this legislation. Any reservations we may have about some aspects of this question should not detract from our wholehearted endorsement of the legislation contained in these two bills. I go further and express the hope that we will have a recorded division on these bills. I think we should let the whole world know that on this question Canadians are united and unanimous in the support of exercising jurisdiction over pollution in the Arctic archipelago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I think this House should seize an early opportunity to make clear to our friends south of the border that we will not tolerate anyone pushing this government around. This is a privilege which we reserve for the opposition!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): It would have been preferable if the government had made a forthright declaration of sovereignty over the Arctic rather than restricting itself to an assertion of jurisdiction to control pollution. I indicated in the House on January 22 on behalf of the NDP our wholehearted support of the statement which was unanimously endorsed by the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development in their report of Tuesday, September 16, 1969. They stated in that report:

Your committee recommends that the government of Canada indicate to the world, without delay, that vessels, surface and submarine, passing through Canada's Arctic Archipelago are and shall be subject to the sovereign control and regulation of Canada.